

I assume the intention was to provide that there should be at least one superior court judge resident in the county and that he ordinarily should preside in that court. I think if you insert the word "ordinarily" in the Grant Amendment No. 8, that would do several things. It would provide that while the resident judge ordinarily, usually, would preside in that court, he would not be precluded from being moved elsewhere as the demands in other counties dictated.

It would also not preclude a judge of the superior court from any place in the State being brought in.

I take it that Delegate Grant has already withdrawn his amendment, or agreed that Amendment No. 9 takes its place. If that is true, I would like to re-offer Amendment No. 8 with myself and any others who might want to join as sponsors. Again the change would be simply inserting one word in Amendment No. 8 at line 3, after the words "who shall" before the word "preside" the word "ordinarily" so that it would read, "who shall ordinarily preside over the Superior Court in that county". That would have the effect, as I say, of seeing to it that the judge who lived in the county would ordinarily preside in the superior court of that county, but would not preclude him from being moved elsewhere, if his time were not fully occupied, to some place where it was needed. I may be wrong but Amendment No. 9 would seem to preclude the shifting of judges from one superior court to another.

I, therefore, would like to re-offer Amendment No. 8 with the word "ordinarily" inserted after the words "who shall" and before the word "preside" in line 4.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you mean you are offering that now as a substitute for the substitute, I think I have to rule you out of order, Delegate Sybert.

DELEGATE SYBERT: I think that is what the parliamentary effect would be.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think the motion is in order at this time. For what purpose does Delegate Weidemeyer rise?

DELEGATE WEIDEMEYER: I rose to say I would like to join Delegate Sybert and ask Delegate Chabot if he would withdraw his Amendment No. 9 so we could take No. 8 as Delegate Sybert suggested and proceed to get this matter settled.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Chabot.

DELEGATE CHABOT: I respectfully

suggest that we will get it settled if we vote on 9 as it has been accepted by the people who had originally offered 8.

THE CHAIRMAN: For what purpose does Delegate Johnson rise?

DELEGATE JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of making an observation hopefully for clarification.

THE CHAIRMAN: Proceed.

DELEGATE JOHNSON: We become involved in this particular hassle which understandably is important because in questioning, one of our delegates spotted the fact it is just possible that a county could be left without a superior court inasmuch as it is not spelled out.

However, Chairman Mudd clearly indicated that it is the intention of the Committee that there shall be at least one superior court in each county and at least one superior court resident judge in each county.

I strongly urge that we leave this matter to the Committee on Style to straighten out. It can be easily corrected by saying something like there shall be one Superior Court in one county and at least one resident superior court judge in each county or something to that effect and I urge the makers of the various motions and amendments to withdraw that and leave this matter for Style. The record is clear and the intent will be carried out.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Chabot has indicated he does not desire to do that. For what purpose does Delegate Kiefer rise?

DELEGATE KIEFER: Mr. President, along the lines of Delegate Johnson. I would like to ask Delegate Mudd if this is a correct interpretation, that there is to be one superior court located in each county and one superior court judge resident in each county.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Mudd.

DELEGATE MUDD: That was our intention, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not sure the Chair understands because the purpose of the amendment is that there be only one superior court; the purpose of the recommendation as the Chair understands it is there is to be only one Superior Court in the entire State. Therefore, I did not understand either the question or the answer. Delegate Mudd.

DELEGATE MUDD: As I think I com-